

STATE OF MISSOURI MISSOURI DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT PROGRAM

SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT DISTRICT ANNUAL REPORT

1. SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT DISTRICT

Region D Recycling & Waste Management District

2. FISCAL YEAR PERIOD:

FROM JULY 1, 2008TO JUNE 30, 2009

GOALS AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS

3 (a). What waste goals did the district have for the fiscal year period and what actions did the district take to achieve these goals?

The District waste goals continue to provide recycling and proper disposal for banned and hard to dispose of materials to the residents of the District. This goal is a waste reduction of many residents sheds, barns and/or yards or fields. There is little or no opportunities for proper disposal or recycling opportunities beyond the opportunities provided by the District. Being mainly rural District residents often store or stack materials on their property. Although education is very important the opportunity must be provided to keep residents from dumping or storing many banned items.

The District held collections through out the district for scrap tires, household hazardous waste including agricultural waste, appliances and miscellaneous metals collections. Education is provided through handouts given to participants at the collections.

D2008-04 District-wide Recycling Collctions - \$65,000 + \$610.12 income from tire collections and ink jet cartridge return program = \$65,610.12. Collections superceded budget. Record numbers of electronics and hhw resulted in a budget shortfall of \$10,327.83. Executive Board approved (July 9, 2009 minutes) spending interest funds to complete the project. Procedures for 2010 are being modified to eliminate budget shortfalls in the future.

RECEIVED BY

OCT 26 2009

SWIND OPERATIONS

3 (b). What waste goals does the district have for the upcoming fiscal period and what actions does the district plan to take to achieve these goals. Please include the types of grant proposals that will be sought for the upcoming period to assist in meeting these goals.

The District has secured funding for district-wide collections of hard to dispose of or banned items for 2010. Meetings are currently being scheduled to evaluate collection procedures for 2010. Overwhelming responses in 2009 resulted in budget shortfalls. Charging, strict restrictions on quantity, eliminating some events are being explored to avoid budget shortfalls in the future.

D2010-07

Region D Recycing & Waste Mgmt District

District-Wide Collections

\$60,330.62

All grant proposals are considered and evaluated. No specific types of grants are sought. Every grant application is evaluated and scored using the same criteria. A minimum score has been established. Grant applications scoring below the minimum score are not considered for funding.

4 (a). What recycling goals did the district have for the fiscal year period and what actions did the district take to achieve these goals?

1.Recycling goals include recycling opportunities to be explored before proper disposal. Scrap tire collections provided collected tires baled into wind breaks, household hazardous waste collections provided recycling of usable latex paint for reuse, flammables collected for fuel blending at cement kilns, appliances and miscellaneous metals collections recycled all types of metals, electronic collections contractor recycles every componet of electronics including wood cabinets on console tys.

D2008-03 D2009-01 D2009-02 D2009-03 D2009-04	Region D Recycling & Waste Mgt City of Cameron Clinco Sheltered Workshop Andrew County Recycling City of Savannah	Education Recycling Trailer Bins, gaylords and forks Concrete parking and drive Recycling Truck	\$6,751.39 \$15,000 \$7,586.78 \$2,811.60 \$8,500.00
D2009-04	City of Savannah	Recycling Truck	\$8,500.00

RECEIVED BY

OCT 2 6 2009

MO 780-1989 (06-08)

2.

SWMP OPERATIONS

4 (b). What recycling goals does the district have for the upcoming fiscal year period and what actions does the district plan to take to achieve these goals? Please include the types of grant proposals that will be sought for the upcoming period to assist in meeting these goals.

Recycling is a priority over proper disposal. Contractors are sought for recycling procedures rather than proper disposal. Goals continue to be reduction for the landfill.

Grants are not sought for trash disposal. Evaluation is very clear on recycling goals.

D2010-01	Region D Recycing & Waste Mgmt	Operations/Education	\$75,898.00
D2010-02	City of Stewartsville	Recycling Drop-Off Center	\$3,500.00
D2010-03	Andrew County Recycling	Recycling Trailer	\$2,000.00
D2010-04	Clinco Sheltered Industries	Dock and recycling bins	\$10,000.00
D2010-05	City of Plattsburg	Recycling Trailer	\$3,500.00
D2010-06	Clinton County Commission	Recycing Trailer	\$4,500.00
D2010-07	Region D Recycling & Waste Mgmt	District-Wide Collections	\$60,330.62
D2010-08	City of Cameron	Recycilng Education	\$1,500.00

5 (a). What resource recovery goals did the district have for the fiscal year period and what actions did the district take to achieve these goals?

Resource recovery goals include providing recycling opportunities to local organizations and local governments. Containers are provided for school events and local community events. The District participates in local events promoting recycling opportunities.

RECEIVED BY

OCT 26 2009

SWMP OPERATIONS

5 (b). What resource recovery goals does the district have for the upcoming fiscal year period and what actions does the district plan to take to achieve these goals? Please include the types of grant proposals that will be sought for the upcoming period to assist in meeting these goals.

The District will continue to provide recycling containers for community and school activities. The District will purchase additional containers and recycling promotional items to continue resource recovery activities.

6. SUMMARIZE THE TYPES OF PROJECTS AND RESULTS DURING FISCAL YEAR (ADDITIONAL SHEETS MAY BE ATTACHED IF NEEDED.)

Landfills.	Name of Project Resulting in Tonnage Diversions from	Cost of Project.	Number of Tons Diverted.	Average Cost Per Ton Diverted.
------------	---	------------------	--------------------------	-----------------------------------

D2008-04 District-Wide Collections	\$65,000.00 + 610.12 tire fees & ink jet cartridge income + \$10,327.83 additional funds requested.	112.09 tons tires, 17.74 tons hhw, 54.1 tons appliances & misc metals, 41.98 tonnage electronics	\$336.14 recycling or proper disposal fees
D2009-01 Cameron Recycling Trailer	\$15,000.00	New trailer has not yet been purchased.	
D2009-02 Clinco Recycling for gaylords and forks	\$7,586.78	478.82 tons	
D2009-03 Andrew County Concrete Drive	\$2,811.60	146.59 tons	
D2009-04 Savannah Recycling Truck	\$8,500.00	33.01 tons	

Measurable outcomes achieved.

All projects have exceeded goals.

RECEIVED BY

OCT 26 2009

SWMP OPERATIONS

MO 780-1989 (06-08)

Projects not resulting in tonnage diversions from landfills.	Cost of Project
D2008-02 District Operations	\$58,291.41
D2008-03 Education	\$6,740.74

Measurable outcomes achieved for these projects.

8. IDENTIFY SEPARATE STATISTICS FOR ITEMS BANNED FROM LANDFILLS				
List projects resulting in tonnage diversions from landfills.	List cost of project resulting in tonnage diversion.	Number of tons diverted from project.	Average cost per ton diverted.	
D2008-04 District-Wide Collections	\$53,974.68 cost of tires, hhw and appliances	183.93 tons	\$293.45	

	,			
9. IDENTIFY SEPARATE STA	 TISTICS FOR ITEMS NOT BANN	ED EDOM I ANDELLIC		
List projects resulting in	List cost of project resulting in	Number of tons diverted from	Avera	ge cost per ton
tonnage diversions from landfills.	tonnage diversion.	project.	divert	
D2008-04	\$10,960.20 for electronics	41.98 tons	\$261.	08
			V 201.	
		,		
10. Describe your district's gran	nt proposal evaluation process.			
criteria may be added. The crit	annually. Evaluation criteria is devertia is evertiant applicated in a sent with the grant applicated in the criteria is devertial.	reloped using DNR's required corrions.	iponents a	dditional evaluation
				:
A committee of four made up of Executive Board evaluate the a	f Region D Recycling & Waste Ma	nagement District Board Members eed funds available, the committee	s, some ar	e also members of the
grant 100% and then decrease	the funding request to each applic	cation in the order of ranking. The	committe	e makes
recommendations to the full concernities member has interes	uncil. Only after the full council ha	is given approval are the application cused from evaluating the grant.	ons sent to	DNR for approval. If a
for the evaluation process. Sev	reral years ago the evaluation con	nmittee would evaluate the applica	tions on th	eir own Current
members decided to evaluate to	he applications as a group, allowir	ng for discussion. The group usua	lly meets o	during the week in the
District provides supper for the	members.	nately 3-3-1/2 hours depending on	tne numb	er of applications. The
2009 Evaluation Criteria is attac	nhad			
2009 Evaluation Chiena is attac	mea.			
CNA more				
RECEIVED BY				
OCT 2 6 2009				
•				
		SWMP OPERATION	VS	·
			- •	
				,
MO 780-1989 (06-08)				Andrew 1-14-1-1-1-1-1-1
•				
BOARD AND COUNCIL MEMB				
☐ Board Member ☐ C	ouncil Member	Address:		
Name:				
Representative of:		City:	State:	ZIP:
☐County ☐Public				
• –				
☐City ☐Other		Phone:	Fax:	
Officer		F 11.	<u> </u>	
Officer:	5 0 .	E-mail:		
☐Chair ☐Vice-Chair	☐Secretary			ŀ

Region D Recycling & Waste Management District District Grant Evaluation Review Form 2009

Project Title:				
Applicant Name:				
Applicant Address:	State:	Ziip code		
Amount Requested:	Total Project Cos	t:		
Project Category (Circle One) Waste Reduction Market Developm	ent Education			
1. Conforms with State Resource Recovery Pri work towards waste reduction and implementing M (enclosed).	Missouri's Policy on	ranted to pro Resource Re	jects which ecovery	
10 points - The project is for waste reduction 5 points - The project is for collection / proceedings.	cessing, market dev	elopment or		
2 points - The project is for energy recoverPoints	у.			
2. Conforms to Targeted Materials as approved 10 points - The project reduces or recycles a 5 points - The project reduces or recycles and the second	a targeted material i a targeted material i	in list A. in list B.		
3 points - The project reduces or recycles a 0 points - The project does not involve any		ted.	RECEIVED BY	
Points	,		OCT 2 6 2009	
3. Economic Development: 25 points – Project employs an employee we continue the project for two years an employee of the project employees an employee of the continue the project beyond to points – No commitment to continue the project beyond funding. Points	ars beyond the gran e with a one-year co the grant fund.	mitment to t funding. ommitment	WMP OPERATIONS	
4. Local private or public competition for similar purchases in direct competition with existing busin 10 points – Proposal does not have direct competition 5 points – Proposal is in minimal competition points – Proposal is in direct competition Points	ess. ompetition with any on with a District bus	District siness.	oment	
Total Bainta Bara 4 SE Bainta I	Daasibla			

5. De criteri term.	gree of was on evaluates	te reduction or recycling or results in an environmental ber reduction or recycling or environmental benefit impact for shor	nefit: t or long
	10 points –	Proposal results in the reduction or recycling of more than one waste stream component.	
	The second secon	Proposal results in the reduction or recycling of a single waste stream component	
	_Points	·	
docun	nented by let at is located.	forts: works cooperatively with local governments in the Districters, ordinance or resolution from the local governing body in was Documentation of support and approval of the local governing	ct as hich the
		body.	
. 	0 points – Points	No documentation of support from local governing body.	
federa why p state a this w	al, state and lermits are ne and local per ill be accomped in the app	•	ussion of federal, on of how ould be
	10 points –	Proposal demonstrates that all federal, state and local permits,	
		approvals, licenses or waivers necessary to implement the project have been applied for (copies of applications	
		attached) and/or demonstrates that permits are not needed.	RECEIVED B
	5 points –	Proposal indicates awareness of necessary permits but	OCT 2 6 2009
	0 points -	applications have not been submitted. Applicant submitted no evidence of obtaining needed	SWMP OPERATION
	Daluta	permits and no documentation that permits are not needed.	OAAIM OI BEILITION
	Points		
8. Co laws.		ith Local Zoning Laws: A discussion of compliance with local	-
		Proposal demonstrates that project is in compliance with local z Provides documentation to compliance.	
		roposal indicates awareness of local zoning laws, with no docu Applicant submitted no evidence of local zoning laws complianc	
9. Tra applica	ation, if prove	of Results: criterion will determine whether the project has set en successful, lends itself to being easily duplicated by others. Information from this project will be actively disseminated to othe	
	3 points – Ir	a plan. iformation from this project demonstrates the possibility of trans	_
	•	roject results to others. roposal does not demonstrate transferability.	
	, UIIIO		
	Total Po	sints - Page 2 45 Points Possible	

 10. Need for the information: criterion will be evaluated by the evidence dependence of the proposed project. 10 points – Proposal provides documentation for need for proposed points – Proposal reports need for proposed project with no documentation. 10 points – Proposal reports need for proposed project with no documentation. 10 points – Proposal does not demonstrate need. 11 Points 	project
11. Technical Capability of Applicant: the ability of the applicant to imple the project based on previous work experience and demonstrated expertise Resumes from those individuals with operational responsibilities for the proj 7 points – Extensive experience (5 years or more) 5 points – Limited experience 0 points – No experiences Points	in the field.
12. Managerial Experience of Applicant: resumes of project manager	RECEIVED BY
7 points – Extensive experience (5 years or more)	OCT 2 6 2009
5 points – Limited experiences 0 points – No experience	SWMP OPERATIONS
Points	OWMI OF CHATIONS
 13. Project Implementation: feasibility of completing the project in realistic 10 points – Project likely to be completed in a timely manner based of and other data. 5 points - Implementing project in a timely manner is a concern. 0 points - Project is not likely to be implemented in a timely manner. Points 14. Technical Feasibility: Is the technology or data available to implement 10 points – Project will provide new and useful technology for waster resource recovery efforts 5 points – Project may provide new and useful technology for waster resource recovery efforts 0 points - Project will provide relatively little new or useful technology reduction or resource Points 	this project? reduction or
 15. Availability of Feedstock: measure the strength of commitment of feed needed to complete the project as documented by letters of commitment, converifiable documentation. 5 points – Proposal identifies a sufficient supply of feedstock within the recovered materials are not needed. 3 points – Proposal identifies a sufficient supply of feedstock outside 0 points – Adequate supply of feedstock is questionable. Points 	ontracts or other ne District or that
 16. Committed Financing: strength of commitments for financial resources letter, contract or other verifiable documents. 10 points – All financing for the project is committed and documented 3 points - Sufficient financing is likely, but not yet committed 0 points - Proposed financing is questionable. Points 	·
Total Points – Page 3 59 Points Possible	

17. Type of Contribution: Cash Match or In-kind Match	
20 points – 50-100% cash match	
10 points – up to 50% cash match 7points - 100% in-kind match	
5 points – Combination cash/in-kind match	
Points	
18. Marketing Strategy: A marketing strategy defines how materials manufactured will be distributed from the collection point or producer	collected or
market. A marketing strategy should include information on how mat advertised, packaged and distributed.	erials are to be sold,
20 points – The project has a strong marketing strategy, utilizing industries.	
3 points – The project has an acceptable marketing strategy, than Clinco.	
0 point - The marketing strategy for the project is questional Points	ole:
19. Quality of Budget: Budget must delineate percentage of request Budget must provide itemized expenses in the form of budget notes. \$2,999.99 require documentation 15 points — Budget is complete	ed funds and match. Expenses over
5 points – Expenses are not itemized and budget note for expenses are not included.	xpenses over \$2,999.99
0 points – Requested funds not directly related to scope of water spent most efficiently?	ork and will they be
Points	•
20. Financial Ratios: Selected values on entity's financial statement of \$50,000 or more.	t. Required for requests
10 points – Financial statements or credit histories are included 0 points - No financial statement or credit history included Points	d ·
21. Completeness of Application: pre-application checklist, applicate executive summary, bid record/procurement form and required attach 25 points – Complete with no additional data required to complete application	ments are:
5 points - Substantially complete but additional data is require 0 points - Not complete or insufficient data for consideration Points	ed to complete review.
22. Project Site Identification: where project will be located as doculease or other verifiable documentation.	imented by letters,
10 points – Location within the District 5 points - Location within adjoining District in a cooperative el 0 points - Location not identified	ffort
Points	RECEIVED BY
Tatal Datas - Day - 4 - 400 T - 4 - T - T - T - T - T - T - T - T -	OCT 2 6 2009
Total Points – Page 4 100 Points Possible	SWMD ODED ATIONS

23. Past Performance Rating:				
-0 points - Applicant has demonstrated satisfactory performance in the administration				
of previous grants25 points – Applicant has demonstrated less than satisfactory performance in the administration of previous grants.				
-50 points – Applicant has failed to meet the minimum performance requirements of previous project funded by the District, or MDNR due to non-criminal				
mismanagemen	t.	oral Cado to Hon-Online		
-125 points – Applicant has b	een convicted of defrauding	the District or MDNR, or has		
failed to honor	a previous contractual agree	ement with the District or		
MDNR.				
Total Points – Page 5	-0 Points Possible			
Total Points - Dans 4	EE Daluda Danaiki.			
Total Points – Page 1	55 Points Possible			
Total Points – Page 2	45 Points Possible			
Total Points – Page 3	59 Points Possible			
Total Points – Page 4	100 Points Possible			
Total Points – Page 5	0 Points Possible			
		RECEIVED BY		
Total Points 259 I	Points Possible	OCT 2 6 2009		
iotai i onits 239 i	-ones rossible			
		SWMP OPERATIONS		
Annlications must	t score 125 to be eligible fo	r fundina		
Applications must	. Score 120 to be engine ic	r lunung.		
Signature of Reviewer		Date		